

suggests forming partially overlapping regions such as are recited in claim 1 on the upper surface of the semiconductor film. Yamazaki, which describes using two laser annealing steps, with the first step crystallizing a relatively shallow region 5 to 100 nm deep from the surface, and the second step crystallizing a relatively deep portion 50 to 1000 nm deep (see col. 4, line 51 to col. 5, line 6), is silent as to the overlap of different regions in a direction in which a laser moves. While the admitted prior art shows overlapping regions in Figs. 4A and 27C, the overlap is along the entirety of the first direction. Thus, in the admitted prior art, the first region overlaps with all of the second region along the first region, rather than only a portion of the second region along the first direction.

The "Response to Arguments" included at the end of the rejection addresses this argument by focusing on the "only a portion" language of the claim while ignoring the "along the first direction" language. Applicant does not necessarily disagree with the definition of "overlap" set forth in the rejection. Rather, what applicant disagrees with is that the "along the first direction" language of claim 1 is ignored by the rejection..

As set forth in claim 1, "the first region of the upper surface of the semiconductor film overlaps with only a portion of the second region of the upper surface along the first direction." Thus, along the edge of the second region extending in the first direction, the second region would extend beyond one or both ends of the first region. As has been previously discussed, such an arrangement is not described or suggested by Yamazaki, Andra, the admitted prior art, or any combination of the three. Instead, the admitted prior, for example, shows overlapping regions that overlap along the entirety of the first direction.

Independent claims 2-6 similarly recite using the same laser beam to form first and second crystalline regions, and that the first region of the upper surface of the semiconductor film overlaps with only a portion of the second region of the upper surface along the first direction. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6 and their dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 19-24 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamazaki '080 in view of Andra, admitted prior art and Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,730). Applicant requests

Applicant : Koichiro Tanaka
Serial No. : 09/842,797
Filed : April 27, 2001
Page : 3 of 3

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-034001 / US4891

reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yamazaki '730 does not remedy the failure of the other references to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims from which claims 19-24 depend.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.


A check in the amount of \$300.00 (\$120 for the one-month extension of time and \$180.00 for the Information Disclosure Statement fee) is enclosed. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

3/23/05

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
JFH/adt
40272482.doc



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640